## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application and the claims is respectfully requested.

Specification

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C §132(a) as allegedly introducing new matter by the previously amended claim language, "generating observation sentence." The term "sentence" is being amended to "text" in claims 1-5, 8-13, 16 and 17. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-5, 8-13, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement with respect to the previously amended claim language "generating observation sentence." As mentioned above, the term "sentence" is being amended to "text".

35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-5, 8-13, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent system claims 1, 9, 16 and 17 are amended to further recite a "processor," and independent method claims 10 and 11 are amended to recite a "computer-implemented method." Support is found in Figs. 2A and 2B and the corresponding description on pages 17 and 18 of the originally submitted specification. Claims 12 and 13 are

amended to recite a "computer storage device readable by a computer, having a program of instructions executable by the computer" as disclosed on page 81, lines 16-24.

35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejects all pending claims, i.e., claims 1-5, 8-13, 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,047,259 to Campbell et al., (hereinafter "Campbell") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,321,861 to Oon et al., (hereinafter "Oon"). Without conceding to the propriety of the rejection, independent claims 1, 9, 10-13, 16 and 17 are being amended. Support for the amendment can be found at least on page 33.

Campbell et al. and Oon et al. whether taken alone or in combination do not disclose or suggest every element claimed in independent claims as amended. For example, the cited references do not disclose or suggest at least arranging "a word and phrase that have been, in advance, associated with the supplementary information relating to the selection result obtained by the supplementary information result obtaining unit before and after the observation term relating to the selection result obtained by the observation term selection result obtaining unit" claimed in independent claim 1 and similarly claimed in independent claims 9-13, 16 and 17. The Office Action appears to be citing Oon et al.'s column 23, line 59 to column 33, line 39 as allegedly reading on that element. While that section of Oon et al. appears to disclose deriving a prefix/suffix of a word, and generating a shortened word by concatenating the derived prefix/suffix, Oon et al. and Campbell et al. do not disclose or suggest arranging words and phrases associated with the selected supplementary information before and after the observation term relating to the selection result.

On the other hand, in the novel observation input process of the present disclosure (shown in Figs. 6A and 6B) and as claimed, a CPU performs the process in which a text is generated by arranging, before and after an observation term, a word or phrase that is associated with a selected attribute, particular region (i.e., supplementary information), or like. Furthermore, in the present application, a CPU automatically generates the observation sentence using a word or phrase that is associated with a selected attribute, particular region (i.e., supplementary information), or like. In the present application, the system performs the process of generating text out of its observation, and thus it is helpful for a patient or like having little medical knowledge to understand the contents of the observation. Campbell et al. and Oon et al. fail to show such arrangement of words in a text that describes the observation contents, for example, for aiding in easy understanding.

For at least the above reasons, independent claims 1, 9-13 and 16-17, and their respective dependent claims at least by virtue of dependencies are unobvious over the cited references.

This communication is believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and every effort has been made to place the application in condition for allowance. A favorable Office Action is hereby earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite prosecution of this case, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner call applicant's attorney at (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,

Eunhee Park

Eunhee Park
Registration No. 42,976

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza – Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343
TS/EP:vh